

Utah State University

**DigitalCommons@USU**

---

Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity  
Committee

Faculty Senate

---

10-10-2008

## Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee Minutes, October 10, 2008

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fdde](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fdde)

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee Minutes, October 10, 2008" (2008). *Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee*. Paper 37.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fdde/37](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fdde/37)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



## **FDDE Minutes 10 08 08**

1. Review code changes:
  - a. GLBT nondiscrimination code passed by faculty senate on Monday,
  - b. Change allowing tenure candidates to submit names of people that do not want to be contacted as external reviewers – approved on first readings with additional phrase “for the department head and tenure committee consideration”
  - c. Caregiving policy: has hit unexpected roadblocks 1) where does it belong in the code? Would prefer it to be in the faculty senate section of the code, but some argue that it belongs in the HR section of the code where other references to leave and benefits are. BrandE Fapell argues that it goes in faculty code b/c it only effects faculty and not staff. Ronda has a meeting scheduled with HR and Mike Parent this month. Issues that will likely be raised – why only faculty and not staff as well?
2. October 20-FSEC will meet to set agenda for Faculty Forum. Need to address placing caregiving policy on faculty forum agenda. Concern is that there are several other competing topics – T & P process transparency, internationalization, student ratings,
3. Parking for pregnant and nursing mothers does in fact apply to both staff and faculty.
4. Rauol Arreola’s talk: most of the people at the talk left with the sentiment that professionally developed ratings are the best solution; informal communication with the Provost suggests that he is supportive of professional rating forms, and is willing to work toward financing the change. The primary factors identified that influence ratings are required/not required status, quantitative vs. nonquantitative, level of class (freshman, sophomore, etc.); gender and ethnicity has not been identified as a highly salient issue in faculty ratings nationally. Need to determine if faculty senate ad hoc committee addressing student ratings is still in place, and if so begin planning for pilot test of standardized rating.
5. Currently testing an online system for evaluating hiring processes in each department and college. Each committee member completes open ended form online about hiring process. This will be followed by a cross campus meeting aimed at identifying similarities and differences across departments in the hiring process. Initial pilot testing has identified biases, and striking differences in approaches to gathering and using information about candidates. FDDE members will access the demo by next meeting so that we can discuss it next meeting.
6. Concern raised about process for training ombudspersons – estimated that about 50% of current ombudspersons have not been through the training. Larry Smith is over the ombudsperson program, Maria has agreed to ask him for the list of

approved ombudspersons which we can then compare those to our own college lists.

Priorities for this year:

- 1) Follow through on code changes
- 2) Continue discussions about student ratings -if the ad hoc committee from last year has been disbanded, FDDE will likely take on this issue this year – Maria and Robert have agreed to spearhead this task
- 3) Data indicators – faculty data are collected in October every year and given to analysis and assessment office. It has been observed that these data are full of errors, which Advance has cleaned every year of its existence before analysis. Ann Austin's office has agreed to work with the assessment office to make sure that the data are cleaned before they are forwarded to her office and the Provost's office.
- 4) Family friendly policies to be made more explicit – Ann Austin's office is hosting a family forum next week and we can address these issues more explicitly